

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is requested of all rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 102:

The rejection of claims 1 and 4 is based on Komuro et al. (US 6,530,141), particularly their figure 15. In response, we have elected to cancel claims 1-3.

Concerning claim 4, examiner has made us aware that words such as 'oppose' and 'abut' may be subject to more than one interpretation. We have therefore eliminated these words from claim 4 and have substituted terms whose meanings are less susceptible to multiple interpretations.

As now worded, the structure described in our claim 4 is patently distinguishable from Komuro's figure 15 for the following reasons:

(1) Komuro's secondary lower magnetic pole 18 does not contact primary lower pole 15 only at a surface that is normal to the substrate (the latter is not shown by Komuro but, by definition, it underlies, and is parallel to, layer 15).

(2) Komuro's structure teaches only a single non-magnetic layer. Our claim 4 claims first and second non-magnetic layers.

(3) The secondary lower magnetic pole claimed in our claim 4 fully covers the primary lower magnetic pole. Komuro's layer 18 only partially covers his primary lower magnetic pole 15.

Reconsideration is requested of all rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 103:

The additional references cited (Takano and Sasaki) are argued to relate to dependent claims 5-10. When examiner states "Sasaki et al. disclose: The write head described in claim 4 wherein said first layer of high magnetic permeability material is.....", it is unclear whether he is asserting that Sasaki describes a write head that is

patently similar to the one disclosed in our claim 4 or whether he is merely providing evidence that materials listed in dependent claim 7, as high permeability materials, are well known. A similar ambiguity exists with the respect to our claims 4 and 8. If examiner is arguing that Sasaki reads on our claim 4, we respectfully request that he provide us with column/line reference(s) in Sasaki that teach a write head whose lower pole is formed of two parts, with the upper part extending away from the lower part towards the ABS while resting on a non-magnetic under-layer.

Absent any evidence from examiner that Sasaki reads on claim 4, references 5-10 are not relevant to a rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Examiner also cites Takano (column 11, lines 37-49) as teaching a method to form a ledge that extends away from a surface based on using a focused ion beam. This is not understood since claim 4 is a structures claim, not a method claim, and does not teach how the ledges that it describes are formed. Of greater relevance is Takano's FIG. 14 (also cited by examiner) which shows a ledge structure for a lower magnetic pole. It would not, however, have been obvious to use Takano's ledge since it requires at least two non-magnetic under-layers (which are nor disclosed by Takano), making it more expensive than the single under-layer structure of the present invention. Furthermore, Takano's lower magnetic pole has a non-planar upper surface whereas the upper surface of our lower pole is planar over its entire extent. This also makes Takano's structure more expensive than ours (because a CMP step is required for Takano's structure before the write coils can be formed).

Since Takano teaches what he believes to be the most cost-effective pole structure possible, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to invent a more cost effective one, as we have been able to do, resulting in the present invention.

Appl. No. 10/706,381
Amdt. dated 04/15/2007
Reply to Office action of 03/14/2007

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

SAILE ACKERMAN LLC
28 Davis Avenue
Poughkeepsie
NY 12603

By _____

Stephen B. Ackerman
Reg. No. 37761